

OFFICIAL



**HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES
LEGAL DEPARTMENT**

**9410 Key West Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850**

Phone: 301-309-8504

Fax: 301-309-8439

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 11 2004

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: May 11, 2004

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: 4

TO: Examiner M. Brannock - Art Unit 1646
United States Patent & Trademark Office

FAX NO.: (703) 872-9306

PHONE NO.: (571) 272-0869

FROM: Mark J. Hyman (Reg. No. 46,789)

RE: Application No. 09/227,854
Application of: Ni et al.

Att. Docket No. PF210D1
Filed: January 11, 1999

**The following documents were filed by Human Genome Sciences, Inc.
via facsimile on May 11, 2004:**

1. Fax Cover Sheet
2. Statement Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.608(a)
3. Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

**If you experience any difficulty receiving this transmission,
please contact Mark J. Hyman at (240) 314-1224.**

The information contained in this facsimile message is information protected by attorney-client and/or the attorney/work product privilege. It is intended only for the use of the individual named above and the privileges are not waived by virtue of this having been sent by facsimile. If the person actually receiving this facsimile or any other reader of the facsimile is not the named recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the named recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via U.S. Postal Service.

OFFICIALREPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 1646**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RECEIVED**
CENTRAL FAX CENTERIn re Patent Application of:
Ni et al.

Docket No.: PF210D1

MAY 11 2004

Application No.: 09/227,854

Confirmation No.: 7606

Filed: January 11, 1999

Art Unit: 1646

For: Human Chemotactic Cytokine 1 Polypeptides

Examiner: M. Brannock

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.608(a)**Mail Stop AF**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Further to the undersigned's telephone conversation with the Examiner today, Applicants understand that an interference may be declared between the instant application and U.S. Patent No. 6,313,267 (Hitomi et al.). In order to satisfy 37 C.F.R. § 1.608(a), the Examiner has asked Applicants to submit a statement alleging that there is a basis upon which Applicants are entitled to a judgment relative to Hitomi et al.

As discussed with the Examiner, a Rule 608(a) showing should be sufficient to initiate an interference determination, as the effective filing date of the instant application (December 8, 1995) is less than three months after the effective U.S. filing date of the '267 patent (presumably December 6, 1995). The foreign priority claim of Hitomi et al. cannot be taken into account with respect to an interference determination. See M.P.E.P. § 2308.01; M.P.E.P. § 2136.03 (citing *In re Hilmer*):

When an applicant attempts to provoke an interference with a patent, the examiner must determine the effective filing dates of the application and of the patent; only the patent's effective United States filing date will be considered. Any claim of foreign priority by the patentee under 35 U.S.C. 119(a) will not be taken into account when determining whether or not an interference should be declared.

M.P.E.P. § 2308.01 at 2300-20 (emphasis added).

Applicants also note that a Rule 131 declaration was submitted on February 20, 2003, indicating Applicants' possession of the claimed invention in the United States prior to March 6, 1995. Such a declaration is sufficient to antedate the '267 patent's 102(e) date of December 6, 1995 and preclude a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection, unless the '267 patent "claims the same patentable invention as defined in § 1.601(n)" as the instant application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.131(a)(1). Thus, by requesting a Rule 608(a) statement, the Examiner has implicitly asserted that the '267 patent claims the same patentable invention as the instant application. See, e.g., M.P.E.P. § 715.05. Applicants point out, though, that the claims of the '267 patent require the protein to be "calcium-binding," a limitation not present in the claims of the instant application.

However, assuming *arguendo* that the instant application and the '267 patent claim the same patentable invention notwithstanding the differences in the claims, the undersigned attorney of record hereby states the following pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.608(a):

In light of the declaration submitted February 20, 2003 in the instant application, should an interference be declared between the instant application and U.S. Patent No. 6,313,267, there is a basis upon which Applicants are entitled to a judgment relative to the patentees.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below if any further action by Applicants would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Dated: May 11, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Hyman

Registration No.: 46,789
HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES, INC.
14200 Shady Grove Road
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(240) 314-1224

MJP/MJH/PF/ba

US 1013808609P1



Creation date: 05-12-2004
Indexing Officer: FQUIZON - FLORINDA QUIZON
Team: OIPEScanning
Dossier: 10138086

Legal Date: 05-11-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	A...	2
2	SPEC	1
3	CLM	2
4	REM	2

Total number of pages: 7

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on